



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/900,763	07/05/2001	Sadhana S. Rau	16159.009001;P5908	4587

22511 7590 01/06/2005

OSHA & MAY L.L.P.  
1221 MCKINNEY STREET  
HOUSTON, TX 77010

EXAMINER

ZHEN, LI B

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2126

DATE MAILED: 01/06/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

## Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/900,763

Applicant(s)

RAU ET AL.

Examiner

Li B. Zhen

Art Unit

2126

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 19 August 2004.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-44 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-44 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

### Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 4/30/02.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. \_\_\_\_\_.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_.

**DETAILED ACTION**

1. Claims 1 – 44 are pending in the current application.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

2. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(a) the invention was known or used by others in this country, or patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country, before the invention thereof by the applicant for a patent.

3. **Claims 1, 2, 4, 10, 11, 19, 20, 39 and 41-44 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(a) as being clearly anticipated by CVS Web Client, Version 2.2, 4/14/2001 (p. 1- p. 5, cite in previous office action).**

4. As to claims 1 and 39, CVS Web Client teaches the invention as claimed including a mechanism for controlling access to workspaces, comprising:

a repository for storing the workspaces (CVS repository p. 1);

an interface having a set of methods that can be invoked to access the repository (the underlying CVS commands as implied by abilities listed under "Changes:" p. 3);  
and

a server having at least one server object which implements the interface (cvswebread.cgi, p. 3).

Art Unit: 2126

5. As to claim 2, CVS Web Client teaches the invention as claimed including the workspaces comprise files stored under a version control abstraction (CVS repository p. 1).

6. As to claim 4, CVS Web Client discloses the server communicates using HTTP protocol ("using only a web browser" p. 1).

7. As to claims 10 and 19, CVS Web Client teaches the invention as claimed including a proxy object that can be called to forward a request for a method of the server object to the server (the cvswebread.cgi object that forwards requests to the underlying CVS repository).

8. As to claims 11 and 20, CVS Web Client teaches the invention as claimed including the proxy object implements the interface (the proxy object implicitly implements the interface to the underlying CVS repository to allow for checkouts, updates, and searching of the repository).

9. As to claim 41, CVS Web Client discloses a system for remotely accessing workspaces in a network, comprising:

a repository for storing the workspaces (the underlying CVS repository p. 1);

an interface having a set of methods that can be invoked to access the repository (the underlying CVS commands as implied by abilities listed under "changes" p. 3);

a first server that provides management functions for the repository (the CVS server process which is a part of all CVS repositories p. 1); and

a second server having at least one server object that implements the interface and that interacts with the first server to access the repository (cvswebread.cgi p. 3).

10. As to claim 42, CVS Web Client discloses a client that sends messages to and receives responses from the second server (the client's web browser).

11. As to claim 43, CVS Web Client discloses a mechanism for remotely invoking a method of the server object (the client's web browser is remote from the server object).

12. As to claim 44, CVS Web Client discloses the first server comprises at least one object which implements the interface (cvswebread.cgi which implements the interface necessary to access the CVS repository).

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

13. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the

Art Unit: 2126

invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

**14. Claims 3, 5-9, 12-18 and 21-30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over CVS Web Client in view of Tomcat, Version 3.1, 4/18/2000 (cited in previous office action).**

15. As to claim 3, CVS Web Client discloses the limitations as for claim 1 above. CVS Web Client does not disclose a servlet which parses requests sent to the servlet and delegates processing of the requests to the server object. Tomcat discloses a servlet that delegates processing of requests to a server object (p. 2, section 5.3 - request dispatcher).

16. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to use the servlet of Tomcat with CVS Web Client in order to leverage the robustness, scalability and portability of the Java platform that Tomcat is built on.

17. As to claim 5, CVS Web Client does not explicitly disclose the server communicates using HTTPS protocol; however, HTTPS is a well known protocol in the art used in many of the same situations as HTTP. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to use HTTPS to communicate with the system of the CVS Web Client to provide security when accessing the repository over public networks.

18. As to claim 6, it is rejected for the same reasons as claim 3 above.

19. As to claim 7, Tomcat discloses a container which provides runtime support for the servlet (p. 1 "INTRODUCTION").
20. As to claim 8, Tomcat discloses the container is built into a web server (when used "stand alone").
21. As to claim 9, Tomcat discloses the container is connected to a web server (p. 1, "INTRODUCTION").
22. As to claims 12, 21 and 25, they are rejected for the same reason as 3 above.
23. As to claims 13 and 26, they are rejected for the same reason as claim 7 above.
24. As to claim 14, it is rejected for the same reason as claim 8 above.
25. As to claim 15, it is rejected for the same reason as claim 9 above.
26. As to claims 16, 22 and 27, they are rejected for the same reason as claim 4 above.

Art Unit: 2126

27. As to claims 17, 23 and 28, they are rejected for the same reason as claims 5 above.

28. As to claim 29, this is rejected for the same reasons as claims 11 and 20 above.

29. As to claims 18, 24 and 30, they are rejected for the same reason as claim 2 above.

30. **Claims 31-35, 38 and 40 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over CVS Web Client in view of Narayanan (5,689,664, cited in previous office action).**

31. As to claim 31, CVS Web Client discloses a method for executing transactions in a network having a client-side and a server-side, comprising:

calling a method of a proxy object that implements an interface having a set of methods that can be invoked to access a repository of workspaces (cvswebread.cgi).

CVS Web Client does not disclose this object is a client-side proxy object and transmitting the method call to a server-side object which processes the method call and returns the result to the client-side proxy object.

32. Narayanan discloses an object is a client-side proxy object having a set of methods that can be invoked (col. 4, lines 22-24); and transmitting the method call to a



Art Unit: 2126

server-side object which processes the method call and returns the result to the client-side proxy object (col. 4, lines 28-39).

33. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the client-side proxy object of Narayanan with the CVS Web Client to provide an alternate method of access that reduces overhead (col. 4, lines 45-48 of Narayanan).

34. As to claim 32, Narayanan discloses transmitting the method call to the server-side object composes translating the method call into a client request (col. 4, lines 31-35, 208).

35. As to claim 33, Narayanan discloses transmitting the method call to the server-side object further includes transmitting the client request to a server (col. 4, line 36 server object).

36. As to claim 34, it is rejected for the same reasons as claim 4.

37. As to claim 35, it is rejected for the same reason as claim 5.

38. As to claim 38, Narayanan discloses a method of the client-side proxy object is called as a result of executing a command on the client-side (col. 4, lines 30-31).

39. As to claim 40, Narayanan discloses the mechanism comprises a stub which acts as a proxy for the server object and a skeleton that invokes the method on the server object (Fig. 4: 408 stub, 410 skeleton).

40. **Claims 36 and 37 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over CVS Web Client in view of Narayanan (5,689,664) further in view of Tomcat.**

41. As to claim 36, CVS Web Client and Narayanan do not disclose a servlet generating a response. Tomcat discloses a servlet that generates a response (p. 2, section 5.3 – request dispatcher).

42. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to use the servlet of Tomcat with CVS Web Client in order to leverage the robustness, scalability and portability of the Java platform that Tomcat is built on.

43. As to claim 37, CVS Web Client and Narayanan do not disclose a servlet which delegates processing of the requests to the server object. Tomcat discloses a servlet that delegates processing of requests to a server object (p. 2, section 5.3 - request dispatcher).

#### ***Response to Arguments***

44. Applicant's arguments filed August 19, 2004 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

In response to the Non-Final Office Action mailed on May 19, 2004, applicant argues/submits:

(1) "As recited in independent claim 1, in order to manage teamware workspaces, the invention uses a repository for storing the workspaces of each team member, and an interface allowing each team member to use a set of methods to access the repository" (p. 3, lines 2 – 7); and

(2) "CVS Web Client does not disclose or suggest the management of several complete workspaces used by members of the same project" and "CVS Web Client does not disclose or suggest the use of a server-based API as an interface to the repository, which may be used by multiple users of workspaces to access the repository" (p. 3, lines 13 – 19 and p. 4, lines 9 – 18).

In response to submission (1), examiner respectfully notes that independent claim 1 does not require "storing the workspaces of each team member" and "allowing each team member to use a set of methods to access the repository". Claim 1 only recites storing workspaces and accessing the workspace and does not recite team members. Examiner submits that CVS Web Client teaches a repository of workspaces and an interface to access the repository (see rejection to claim 1 above).

As to argument (2), it is noted that the features upon which applicant relies (i.e., "management of several complete workspaces used by members of the same project" and "use of a server-based API as an interface to the repository, which may be used by multiple users of workspaces to access the repository") are not recited in the rejected claim(s). Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from

Art Unit: 2126

the specification are not read into the claims. See *In re Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993).

### ***Conclusion***

45. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).


A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

46. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Li B. Zhen whose telephone number is (571) 272-3768. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon - Fri, 8:30am - 5pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Meng-Ai An can be reached on (571) 272-3756. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Art Unit: 2126

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

  
**SUE LAO**  
**PRIMARY EXAMINER**

Li B. Zhen  
Examiner  
Art Unit 2126

lbz